

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the office action, claims 1 to 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 to 8 and 10 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections. The disclosure was objected to because of an informality.

In this response, claims 1 and 10 have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions, and claims 9, 11 and 12 have been canceled. In the specification, paragraph [0032] has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. In addition, paragraph [0011] and the Abstract have been amended so as to be consistent with amended claims 1 and 10.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 1 to 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 to 8 and 10 have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner to be consistent with the invention described, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2 of the application. Paragraph [0011] and the Abstract were also amended so as to be consistent with the amended claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 to 8 and 10 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:



William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156
(signing for Thomas P. Carty, Reg. No. 44,586)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940